R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 013 254 TE 000 011

AN EVALUATION OF THE USE OF ENGLISH INSTITUTE MATERIALS CENTER CURRICULUM MATERIALS IN NDEA SUMMER INSTITUTES IN ENGLISH.

BY- SHUGRUE, MICHAEL F. AND OTHERS

PUB DATE NOV 66

CONTRACT OEC-2-6-001005-1005

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.12 28P.

DESCRIPTORS- *ENGLISH INSTRUCTION, *INFORMATION DISSEMINATION, *INSTITUTES (TRAINING PROGRAMS), *PROGRAM EVALUATION, FEDERAL PROGRAMS, INSERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION, INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS, TEACHING METHODS, MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, ENGLISH INSTITUTE MATERIALS CENTER, NDEA SUMMER INSTITUTES IN ENGLISH

IN THE SUMMER OF 1966, THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA CONDUCTED A REVIEW OF THE USE AND EFFECTIVENESS OF EXPERIMENTAL CURRICULUM UNITS DISTRIBUTED BY THE ENGLISH INSTITUTE MATERIALS CENTER (EIMC) TO NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT (NDEA) SUMMER INSTITUTES IN ENGLISH AND CLOSELY RELATED AREAS. THE EVALUATORS VISITED 27 INSTITUTES, REPRESENTING A CROSS-SECTION THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES, WHERE WORKSHOPS AND CLASSES WERE OBSERVED AND DISCUSSIONS WERE HELD WITH INSTITUTE DIRECTORS, STAFFS, AND PARTICIPANTS. REPORTS ON VISITS AND QUESTIONNAIRES SENT TO EACH INSTITUTE PARTICIPATING IN EIMC SHOWED THAT EIMC PERFORMED A VALUABLE SERVICE TO NDEA SUMMER INSTITUTES IN ENGLISH, BUT THAT EIMC MATERIALS GENERALLY WERE NOT WELL USED. BECAUSE THEY FREQUENTLY ARRIVED TOO LATE FOR CAREFUL STUDY BY INSTITUTE DIRECTORS AND STAFF, THE MATERIALS WERE NOT INCORPORATED EXTENSIVELY INTO INSTITUTE PROGRAMS BUT WERE UTILIZED ONLY AS REFERENCE MATERIAL OR WERE MERELY GIVEN TO PARTICIPANTS WITHOUT DEMONSTRATION. WHEN EXPOSED TO EIMC MATERIALS THROUGH DEMONSTRATIONS AND WORKSHOPS, HOWEVER, PARTICIPANTS RESPONDED ENTHUSIASTICALLY. THE EFFECTIVENESS OF EIMC MATERIALS COULD BE IMPROVED BY ADDING NEW UNITS AND BY SYSTEMATICALLY INTRODUCING CURRICULUM MATERIALS TO INSTITUTE DIRECTORS, WITH SPECIFIC SUGGESTIONS ON THEIR SELECTION AND UTILIZATION. IN ADDITION, THE ESTABLISHMENT OF CENTERS SIMILAR TO EIMC BY OTHER DISCIPLINES SHOULD BE GIVEN SERIOUS CONSIDERATION. (THE OPERATION OF AN INSTITUTE MATERIALS CENTER IS EXPLAINED IN THE APPENDIX.) (DL)

ED013254

AN EVALUATION OF THE USE OF ENGLISH INSTITUTE MATERIALS CENTER CURRICULUM MATERIALS IN NDEA SUMMER INSTITUTES IN ENGLISH

Michael F. Shugrue, Principal Investigator
Assistant Secretary for English,
Modern Language Association
Director of the English Institute
Materials Center

With the assistance of:

Carl A. Barth
Evanston Township High School

Leo Ruth
Supervisor of Secondary English Teaching
School of Education
University of California at Berkeley

NOVEMBER 1966

TE 000 011

The evaluation reported herein was performed pursuant to contract # C2-6-001005-1005 (CONPASS) with the Office of Education, United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

CONTENTS

	Page
Background and Purpose of the Study	1
Procedure for the Study	3
Conclusions	5
Recommendations	11
Appendices:	
Appendix A: Materials distributed by the 1966 EIMC	15
Appendix B: Institutes visited in the evaluation survey	17
Appendix C: Questionnaire	18
Appendix D: The operation of an institute materials center	20

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

I. Goals of the Study

Because the United States Office of Education has invested heavily in the work of twenty-five Curriculum Study and Demonstration Centers which have been developing new curriculum materials in English since 1961, and has contributed more than $120,000.00 to disseminate experimental units from these Centers in NDEA Summer Institutes in 1965 and 1966, the Modern Language Association believed that a serious field review of the use of the materials in the 1966 English institutes was clearly necessary. The Office of Education provided funds for this first field review of a special phenomenon of the summer institute program, the English Institute Materials Center (EIMC), in order to accomplish four purposes: a) to analyze and evaluate the use of EIMC materials in the 1966 English institutes; b) to report recommendations for improved use of EIMC units to the Office of Education, to institute directors in future summers, and to the profession; c) to call a special conference of Curriculum Study and Demonstration Center Directors in October, 1966, which could use the information gathered in the study to improve future procedures for selecting, editing, and disseminating units, to suggest directions for the use of materials by institute directors and staff, and to give the Study and Demonstration Center Directors an opportunity to measure the impact of and reactions to their curriculum units; and d) to consider the dissemination of experimental, federally-financed curriculum units from other disciplines such as history and geography through the summer institute program.

II. Backgrounds--The English Institute Materials Center

In 1965 the United States Office of Education licensed the Modern Language Association and the National Council of Teachers of English to establish the English Institute Materials Center, which would distribute experimental curriculum materials contributed by the Curriculum Study Centers funded by the Cooperative Research program of the USOE to NDEA Summer Institutes in English and closely related areas. In the summer of 1965 forty-six units, contributed by fourteen Study Centers, were distributed to participants in 168 institutes. In the summer of 1966, under a renewal of the licensing agreement, EIMC distributed twenty-four curriculum publications to participants and staff in 124 institutes in English, Reading, English as a Foreign Language, and Disadvantaged Youth. The materials ranged from language units for the elementary grades to sophisticated lessons on the generative rhetoric of the sentence for advanced senior high school students and included both specific lesson plans and overviews of the entire curriculum program being developed in individual Centers. EIMC further arranged for every person participating or teaching in one of these institutes to receive a status report on the work of the English Program of the Office of Education, "New Materials for the Teaching of English: The English Program of the USOE,"[1] a special Newsletter prepared by the Indiana Curriculum Study Center, and an annotated list of recommended films for use in institutes. (See Appendix A for a complete list of the units offered through the 1966 EIMC.)

[1]Michael F. Shugrue, "New Materials for the Teaching of English: The English Program of the USOE," PMLA, LXXXI, No.4 (September 1966 - Preprint), 36 pages. Available from the Modern Language Association and the National Council of Teachers of English Materials Centers for $.50.

Under a separate contract with the Office of Education, EIMC held a special meeting of the Curriculum Study and Demonstration Center Directors in November, 1965, to improve the selection and dissemination of EIMC units. These directors agreed to submit only classroom-tested units for distribution and to add appropriate introductions outlining the possible use and grade level for each unit. The group recommended, further, that complete sets of the 1966 materials be submitted to 254 directors of institutes in January, 1966, to give them time to study and select the units which they wished to order. The experience of the first year of EIMC and the practical suggestions which emerged from this conference improved both the quality and the use of the materials distributed by the 1966 EIMC.

III. Backgrounds--Previous Evaluation of EIMC

When directors of the 1965 English institutes met in Denver in September, 1965, they urged that EIMC units continue to be distributed. At the same time they registered concern that too much material had been sent out, that it had often arrived late, and that it had received too little formal attention in the institute program.

The Pilot Study to Develop Criteria for Evaluating NDEA Institutes in English,[2] conducted by Donald J. Gray of Indiana University with Office of Education funds in the summer of 1965, supported the general observations of the institute directors. The study showed that while directors, staff, and participants found EIMC useful and often exciting, and wanted EIMC continued, the materials had frequently arrived too late to be fully incorporated into the work of the institute, that each participant had received too many pages of material for proper study in a summer institute, and that, as a result, the principal use made of the materials was as a library resource. Gray, quoting one of his evaluators, notes, "Rather obviously, I think, directors and staff members of English institutes do not take seriously their responsibility to introduce teachers to new media and materials" (p.101). Gray suggests that "one reason college teachers of English did not make much use of new materials in the institutes in 1965 is that they had not troubled to learn much about their value and suitability" (p.16). While Gray could note, on the one hand, that "in none of the thirteen institutes visited ... were these EIMC materials given close and consecutive study in the courses and workshops" (p.100), a participant in one institute could write, on the other hand, "The institute has made me aware of the work begun by the Project English groups and these units have given me vital ideas for improving my teaching" (p.83). The Director-Staff Questionnaire revealed a wistful awareness that, "Perhaps too little attention [was given] to new experimental methods and materials" (p.84).

The interest in EIMC materials expressed in Denver and on many questionnaires, the deplorable neglect of experimental materials--EIMC and other--in the 1965 institutes, and the heavy commitment of federal funds to the development and dissemination of experimental units in English, led naturally to several questions as the summer of 1966 approached: 1) How widely and how well would EIMC units be used in the 1966 institutes? 2) Had improvements in the selection and distribution of units made it easier for institutes to use EIMC effectively? 3) Could institutes in which the materials were being used with unusual effectiveness be identified and could these uses be made known to other directors and staff? 4) Would the establishment of similar projects in other disciplines such as history and geography contribute to the effectiveness of institutes in these fields? An attempt to answer these and other questions led to this report.

[2]Donald J. Gray, "The 1965 Institutes in English: Report of a Pilot Study to Develop Criteria for Evaluating NDEA Institutes in English (April 1966). Available from the MLA and the NCTE Materials Centers for $1.00.

PROCEDURE FOR THE STUDY

I. Evaluators

The study was conducted by three persons, each of whom visited institutes, submitted detailed reports on these visits and recommendations on the use and future of EIMC, and consulted on the preparation of the final report:

Michael F. Shugrue, Assistant Secretary for English, Modern Language Association, the principal investigator, is Director of EIMC and taught EIMC units in the NDEA English Institute at the University of Illinois in 1965.

Carl A. Barth, Evanston Township High School, formerly Research Associate of the Northwestern Curriculum Study Center in English, helped develop curriculum units available through EIMC.

Leo Ruth, Supervisor of Secondary English Teaching, School of Education, University of California at Berkeley, directed an NDEA Institute in English at Berkeley in 1965 which used EIMC materials.

II. On-site Visitations

The three evaluators visited twenty-seven institutes during the summer of 1966. (See Appendix B for a complete list of the institutes visited.) These two-day visits enabled the evaluator to observe institute classes and workshops; to discuss use of EIMC curriculum units with the director, staff members, and participants both formally through scheduled appointments and informally at meals, between classes, and in the evening; and to assess the general attitude of the institute toward the use of new materials and, especially, toward EIMC units.

The institutes which were visited represented a cross-section of special and general, S-1, S-2, and S-3, first and second year institutes, located in large and small public and private colleges and universities throughout the United States. In the range of their visits, evaluators observed or discussed the entire range of the twenty-four units in the EIMC package. While Mr. Shugrue visited eleven institutions alone, Mr. Barth eight, and Mr. Ruth seven, the three as a team visited Fresno State College, Fresno, California, in order to compare their evaluation procedures and to discuss the preliminary stages of the final report of the summer study.

III. Questionnaire

Four copies of a brief questionnaire on the use and value of EIMC were mailed to each institute participating in EIMC in May, with instructions that one copy be completed by the director, one by a staff member, and two by participants. (See Appendix C for a copy of the questionnaire.) On several occasions, the evaluator was able to use the questionnaire to stimulate discussion about

EIMC with institute staff and participants during his visit. A total of 237 responses from sixty institutes represent detailed evaluations from forty-three directors, seventy staff members, and 124 participants. The questionnaires served, then, not only as a useful tool during visitation, but, more important, as a valuable supplement to the on-site visits. The frank, detailed responses of nearly half of those queried contributed enormously to this study.

CONCLUSIONS

The twenty-seven visits to English institutes and the 237 questionnaires completed by directors, staff, and participants in the NDEA Summer Institutes in English in 1966 lead to the following general observations:

1. The English Institute Materials Center performs a valuable service to the NDEA Summer Institutes in English.

Directors, staff members, and participants clearly believe in the value of EIMC. When asked on the questionnaire, "Would you order a selection of EIMC materials again next year?", 197 replied Yes while only five answered No. (Thirty-five respondents, probably all participants, did not answer the question.) Those few who replied No to the question gave such specific reasons for their choice as, "We plan to do an entirely different kind of institute next year--one for which there are no EIMC units," and, "The materials did not apply closely enough to our problems" (an institute for the disadvantaged).

The evaluators also strongly support EIMC. While the first purpose of the institute program must be to prepare teachers in the content of their discipline, no institute can ignore a crucial second responsibility to help teachers translate these new skills and this new knowledge into classroom terms. EIMC helps fulfill this second responsibility.

The visits suggested, too, that directors and participants were more interested in the work emerging from the Curriculum Study Centers than most institute staff members. While one director could emphasize that, "If the institutes are to familiarize teachers with the most recent developments in English teaching, [EIMC materials] must be ordered," another could reflect, "Our staff depended too much upon participants' free use of EIMC materials as reference aids. We should have worked them into our courses." Some staff members did, of course, recognize the need to incorporate new materials into their courses, for as one wrote, the EIMC materials were "Essential to a well-rounded institute program." Participants, however, were most enthusiastic about EIMC. "I learned about new materials and approaches which I had not considered," wrote one. Another noted, "Much of the most practical help I got this summer--the most applicable to the classroom--came from these materials." And a third wrote, "Communication between the research centers and the classroom teacher is essential."

A large number of institute directors in 1966 had examined the materials, at least casually, and were anxious to have participants know something about them. Participants who were exposed to EIMC in any way were universally interested and generally enthusiastic about the quality of the units. Institute staff members, however, unless they had had previous knowledge of the work of the Study Centers and had seen materials in a 1965 institute or elsewhere, had little opportunity to examine the EIMC units before the institute began or to incorporate them into their classes. This last missed opportunity was the great problem of EIMC use in the 1966 institutes. Workshop directors did better than most other staff members only because the units were frequently entrusted to them with the admonition to "use these as part of your workshop." Still one cannot blame staff

members for not integrating into their classes and workshops material which they had not studied and evaluated well in advance of the institute, particularly when they had received no direction in the use of the materials from the director of the institute.

II. EIMC materials were, unfortunately, again generally not well used in the summer of 1966.

Although the use made of EIMC in 1966 was superior to that in 1965, the visits and the questionnaire suggest that, once again, the principal use of EIMC materials in the institutes was as an undirected reference tool. The following tabulations demonstrate both the variety of use made of the units and the continuing practice of relegating EIMC materials to independent reference work.

2. How have EIMC materials been used in your institute?
   64 Demonstration
   98 Lecture
   139 Workshop
   203 Reference

3. If they have not yet been used in your institute, how will they be used? (This question was completed in only a few of the institutes visited early in the summer.)
   5 Demonstration
   4 Lecture
   4 Workshop
   22 Reference

4. Please rate as excellent, adequate, or unsatisfactory the uses made of EIMC in your institute.

	Excellent	Adequate	Unsatisfactory
Demonstration	32	29	5
Lecture	38	49	2
Workshop	44	79	4
Reference	73	95	3

Fewer repondents to the questionnaire were disappointed with the heavy reference use of the materials than one might suppose because directors and staff generally did a better job of telling their participants which materials were available and of introducing informally in each institute the complete library set of EIMC and the special units which had been ordered. The article describing the work of the Centers[3] also allowed many participants to browse through the curriculum units more knowledgeably on their own than in 1965. The figures do suggest, however, that the better the materials were used in an institute, the better they were appreciated by everyone connected with the institute.

[3]For complete bibliographical information, see note #1.

The use of EIMC materials improved over 1965. Ruth, for example, describes the institute at California at Davis, which "offered a more extensive coverage of new materials than any other institute I visited. Featured prominently among these new materials were the EIMC publications. The aim at Davis was to provide a broad survey of available resources. The workshop instructor introduced the materials briefly periodically during the institute and then assigned them to special committees for review in depth. These committees reported to the entire group and led a discussion about the materials. I was able to gather more sharply pointed criticism of the EIMC units from participants at Davis than in any other place."

Shugrue observed that the Christensen material on the generative rhetoric of the sentence from Nebraska's Curriculum Study Center composition materials for the tenth grade actually formed the text for study and discussion in the composition class in the institute at Miles College, Birmingham, Alabama. Ruth noted three of the institutes which he visited using the Christensen principles as the focus of the composition course. One director explained on the questionnaire that the phrase-structure rules from the Oregon Study Center "formed the base for several excellent discussions on the teaching of grammar." Several of the institutes visited did, in fact, use the Oregon material on transformational grammar as their only, or at least, their most important supplementary text in the language course. In the institute at Southern Louisiana University and A & M College, participants were encouraged to teach experimental EIMC units to a demonstration class which met with the institute each morning.

Still, in general, the use was disappointing again in 1966. The completed questionnaires and the reports from the on-site visitations suggest why EIMC and other new materials were not more carefully and conscientiously used.

A. EIMC units did not arrive early enough to be carefully studied by institute directors and staff. One director observed that, "If materials had arrived earlier they could have been incorporated into the syllabus." Another reiterated, "If I could have the materials earlier, I could do a better job." A staff member observed, "With proper planning and use these materials can be used as the basis of a very informative workshop." Perhaps because many directors did not get materials early enough (especially true in the case of the curriculum for the tenth through twelfth grades developed by Carnegie Tech and distributed through the United Business Service Company of Pittsburgh), or because they did not take time to examine EIMC units carefully and promptly, and frequently because they did not have time to or did not choose to share the choice of units to be selected with staff members, many institutes could boast no more careful use than that described by one staff member: "The materials were passed to the student to use as he saw fit. No attempt was made to use them in the workshop. No attempt was made to use them. The units were simply given to the participants for whatever use they wished to make of them."

B. Directors and staff members did not take seriously enough their responsibility to incorporate new materials into the institute program. In his report, Ruth suggests a more fundamental difficulty in getting new materials into the institute programs. He observes that until those in charge of instruction in the discipline of English see more clearly the reciprocal relation of the discipline, its arrangement into curricula, and its modes of

presentation, institute faculties are likely to continue to be neglectful of EIMC materials and many other instructional media. The development of a commitment extending beyond the discipline to the ways it may be shaped, ordered, and presented to students is needed. Faculties of institutes still do not take seriously enough their obligation to introduce teachers to the range of new materials, especially the EIMC material.

The director, particularly, often selected unfamiliar teaching material through which he had casually browsed because he felt the need to choose some new material for his participants. Again too frequently, he consigned these to the workshop director on the assumption that his own fellows on the academic staff would find nothing of instructional relevance for their courses. Instructors were, thus, often denied access to the EIMC materials and to the opportunity of incorporating new ideas into their courses. As a result, despite the general success of the 1966 institutes, the evaluators observed teachers teaching their same old textbooks to impatient teachers.

Some conscientious directors did not receive all of the EIMC materials early enough for them to consult carefully with staff members about the choices which could be well integrated into the curriculum of the institute. Forced to choose alone, many directors chose unusually well. The problem of sharing this important decision on new materials grew increasingly greater when the teaching staff for the summer institute was not on the same campus with the director.

The central problem in getting better use of the materials, then, seems to be getting carefully described units into the hands of directors early enough for careful study and evaluation by the entire staff and providing guidance for the proper evaluation and ordering of EIMC for the institute. One director admitted freely, "In another year the institute director could plan with the teaching staff a more direct and profitable use of such materials." Directors must be encouraged to acknowledge the importance of experimental curriculum materials and to assess their value and place in the institute in close consultation with their teaching staffs.

C. Participants wanted, saw ways to incorporate into the program of the institute, and yet frequently were deprived of planned use of EIMC. Participants saw many uses for the materials:

"If this material were used in conjunction with language, composition, and literature courses of the institute it might profitably be studied. The teachers could compare reactions to the material, discuss possible uses in the classroom, and suggest additions or revisions."

"In the seminars more time and attention could be devoted to the examination and discussion of various units. Have a discussion leader who knows the material well lead the discussion."

Another participant suggested that EIMC units "be used as a basis for demonstration classes to give the participant something readily usable in the classroom when he returns in September."

Still another saw the importance of a "summary of assumptions and methods

on the cover of all books."

One participant even suggested that, "Providing a circuit of speakers, thoroughly familiar with the materials, to introduce the rationale would convey a more accurate picture of what is being accomplished."

One might note ironically that the evaluators were often asked to discuss the English Program of the Office of Education, particular Study Centers, and uses for the materials during their visits. They formed the kind of "circuit of speakers" called for. All three noted how enthusiastic and receptive to new ideas the participants in institutes were. One evaluator observed that after conducting an afternoon workshop on EIMC units during his visit, a participant reflected, "This is the first afternoon that we've done more than talk about what we do in our own classrooms." Participants in some institutes seemed more inventive about possible uses for new materials than some directors and staff. Still, the best institutes were doing everything suggested by enthusiastic participants.

III. Curriculum units from the Study Centers at Nebraska, Northwestern, and Oregon were most frequently and most competently used.

When they were evaluating materials individually, most members of institutes identified Nebraska's composition units for the ninth and tenth grades, Oregon's overview of the curriculum and its phrase-structure rules for the seventh grade, and Northwestern's composition lessons as the freshest, most innovative--and sometimes most controversial--contributions to English curriculum planning. They praised Christensen's generative rhetoric as a significant conception which identified precisely structural and lexical weaknesses in sentences. Some participants felt reservations about Oregon's phrase-structure rules: "I have always had reservations, perhaps unjustified, about erecting a symbol system between the student and the language...." These rules of transformational grammar were clearly the most controversial units in the 1966 EIMC. The overview of the Oregon curriculum was especially popular because it provided participants with the rationale and outline for the entire curriculum program being developed there. In 1967 there must be more such essays. Although Northwestern's composition lessons did not seem strikingly new to many staff members and participants, most felt that the set as a whole, placed as it was in the junior high school, but genuinely useful for the beginning writer of any age, represented a positive advance in getting students to express themselves more concretely, precisely, and imaginatively. The units from these three Centers were the most often discussed, in part because they were the most frequently ordered by institutes. It would be fair to say that they were also the most competently and frequently used EIMC units in the summer of 1966. Every one of the units in EIMC, however, received comment from at least one institute.

The two principal complaints about EIMC materials were that many units seemed too difficult for all but the above-average student and that some units looked like no more than "a refining and improving of what has been done (at least where English was well taught) traditionally." The brief introductory statements which appeared in each unit proved helpful to those using them, but obviously a more extensive rationale for each curriculum will need to be appended to the work of each Center so that participants and staff can place individual units in clearer

perspective. One must remember, for example, that the Nebraska composition units are only part of an articulated, sequential curricululm in language, literature, and composition for grades K-12.

IV. <u>EIMC was handled efficiently</u>.

Although institute directors and staff did not feel that they had received material early enough for them to evaluate and choose units wisely, only a few institutes experienced real difficulties in getting the units which they had ordered in time for the institutes. Most delays occurred in institutes dealing with the United Business Service Company of Pittsburgh. In general, the materials were promptly and efficiently distributed. EIMC units were printed on excellent paper, were clearly readable, and were surprisingly free of typographical errors considering the number of pages available for distribution.

RECOMMENDATIONS

I. Directors need systematic introduction to the nature, value, and use of EIMC materials and guidance in the selection of materials.

A. The key to reform in the use of EIMC material lies in the education of the directors. The director must be induced to rest his attention on EIMC materials long enough to examine in a scholarly fashion their premises, scope, content, and procedures. Perhaps a special institute for directors contemplating the use of EIMC materials would be an effective means of accomplishing this procedure. Perhaps the job can be done through descriptive articles, brochures, reports, and speeches.

B. Once he understands the EIMC materials, the institute director must make them available to his staff and select materials for his institute in close cooperation with them.

C. Complete sets of the materials should be sent to every director who might participate in EIMC at least two full months before he must order his units. Multiple copies of a brief descriptive brochure of the materials should be sent to the director with his complete set so that he can distribute them to his staff members and help them to begin preparing to evaluate and select EIMC units.

D. Continued careful selection of units from the Centers and better descriptions of materials will assist directors and staff as they make their choices. EIMC might distribute not only a brochure describing the units, but suggested patterns of ordering which will make wise use of the 500 page allotment per participant.

II. Certain units should be added to EIMC to make the materials more useful in the institutes.

When asked, "In general, do you favor more useful generalized descriptions of curricula or units composed largely of specific lesson plans?" respondents to the questionnaire preferred 110 specific lesson plans, 45 generalized descriptions, and 30 a combination of the two. Although many participants, especially, wanted specific lesson plans with which they could return to their classrooms in the fall, there was a strong feeling among directors, staff, and some participants that specific units must be balanced by a broad view of a planned curriculum. In visits and on the questionnaire, the following kinds of materials were most frequently requested:

A. An introduction which relates each sample to the total curricular sequence. One needs an overview of the program of a Center and a more detailed discussion of the use of the materials in the classroom.

B. Units for the disadvantaged.

C. units on oral English and speech

D. one complete curriculum sequence

E. units on such aspects of language as the history of the language and social and regional dialects

F. more units on literature, especially on mythology, fiction, and poetry

G. units on creative writing

H. good elementary units on language, literature, and composition

I. good junior high school units on language, literature, and composition

J. more units for the average youngster

K. information about and perhaps even units on non-Office of Education curriculum projects

L. units on such media as the film.

III. <u>The following specific uses can be made of EIMC materials in the institutes</u>:

A. Reference Use

Because reference use is common and important, a complete set of all EIMC materials should be in every institute library. Multiple copies of items particularly relevant to the purposes of the institute should be available. Reference use should not, however, mean unguided use. Someone in the institute should be sufficiently familiar with the content of all units to discuss their strengths and weaknesses on an individual basis as participants desire.

B. Classroom Study in Depth

1. Some of the major ways EIMC units might be used in the workshop are listed below:

a. For analytic examination according to criteria
- What is the unit's purpose, level, direction?
- Are its objectives relevant to its audience?
- What view of the child or adolescent does it presume?
- What view of the nature of learning does it presume?
- What degree of specificity does it possess?
- What are its divisions or groupings?
- What is its sequence?
- Does it provide for the gradation and articulation of its parts?
- Does it provide for the recurrence of concepts?
- What is its relation to extant curricula or textbooks?

b. For comparative studies
   - How do two units on the same topic differ and why?
   - How do they differ in scope, treatment, structure, level, style?

c. For exploration of possibilities for adoption to local circumstances
   - What modifications are needed?
   - What additions or omissions or changes should be made?
   - What combinations are possible? Search them out.

d. For demonstration classes and lessons

e. For models in creating lessons and units

f. Sometimes, for examples of what <u>not</u> to do

2. Some of the major ways in which EIMC units might be used in academic courses are listed below:

   a. For analytic examination according to principles advanced in the course
      - How does the unit exemplify critical principles, linguistic principles, etc. developed in the course?
      - How does the unit violate principles developed here?
      - What view of the nature of literature or language does the the curriculum presume?
      - How valid is the conception?
   b. Not all curricula or units are well suited to be used as texts. Some surely are, notably units of the Nebraska or Oregon type.

   c. Classroom use in breadth
      Some of the major ways EIMC might be used for classroom study in breadth are listed below:
      - throughout a workshop course introduce individual guides. Present them for inspection and comment.
      - have each guide reviewed in depth by individuals or committees who make periodic evaluative reports to the total group.
      - Select particular lessons for analysis and discussion. Choose representative lessons to survey the range of offerings in the guides. Choose lessons for comparative purposes.
      - As they are relevant, comment briefly on guides in academic courses.
      - Invite teachers who have tried out units as guest speakers.
      - Visit summer demonstration school classes where experimental use of materials may be in progress. See the class in action and talk with the teacher afterwards.

IV. <u>Other disciplines should consider establishing operations similar to EIMC</u>.

Despite less than optimum use and despite many problems which this study has reported, other disciplines such as history and geography and reading should

consider making available through such arrangements as an EIMC experimental curriculum materials to participants in their disciplines. Not all materials will be equally worthwhile, but participants in NDEA institutes need and want the opportunity to survey and to study what is new.

V. <u>These recommendations should be discussed and acted upon at the meeting of the Curriculum Study and Demonstration Center Directors</u>.

Happily, the meeting of directors held in New York on 24-25 October 1966 did study this report and utilized many of its suggestions to establish procedures for selecting, editing, presenting, and disseminating EIMC materials for the 1967 Institutes.

APPENDIX A

Materials Distributed by the 1966 EIMC

I. Materials contributed by Curriculum Study Centers in English located at:

(1) Carnegie Institute of Technology

A Senior High School Curriculum in English for Able College-bound Students
- a. Volume I: Tenth Grade
- b. Volume II: Eleventh Grade
- c. Volume III: Twelfth Grade

(2) Teachers College, Columbia University

- a. Teaching English as a Second Language - Description and Samples
- b. Appendix A - Communication Activities

(3) Gallaudet College

Exercises

(4) University of Georgia

- a. Written Composition: A guide for teaching in elementary schools
- b. Source Units: Vocabulary

(5) ISCPET (A State-wide Program in Illinois centered at the University of Illinois, Urbana.)

Guidelines for Academic and Professional Competence

(6) Indiana University

- a. Two Units on Journalism for English Classes
- b. Teacher's Guide to High School Journalism
- c. Teacher's Guide to High School Speech

(7) University of Minnesota

Introduction to the Study of Language

(8) University of Nebraska

a. Language Explorations for Elementary Grades
b. Syntax and the Rhetoric of the Sentence
c. The Rhetoric of Short Units of the Composition

(9) Northwestern University

a. Lessons in the Basic Processes in Composition (Grades 7-8)
b. A Teacher's Experience with Composition
c. Lessons in Simple Forms of Public Discourse

(10) University of Oregon

a. Descriptive essays by the staff (Grades 7-12)
b. Grammaticality and Phrase Structure Rules 1-12
c. Phrase Structure Rules 13-18

(11) Purdue University

A Study Unit in Robert Louis Stevenson's TREASURE ISLAND

(12) University of Wisconsin

Teaching, Speaking and Writing in Wisconsin

II. Additional Materials

Hazard, Patrick. "An Annotated List of Films for Use in 1966 NDEA Institutes."

Jenkinson, Edward B. "The Indiana University English Curriculum Study Center Newsletter" (June, 1966).

Shugrue, Michael F. "New Materials for the Teaching of English: The English Program of the USOE," PMLA, LXXXI, No.4 (September 1966 - Preprint).

APPENDIX B

Institutes Visited in the Evaluation Survey Were Located on the Following Campuses:

ALABAMA	Miles College, Birmingham
CALIFORNIA	California State College, Los Angeles Chico State College, Chico Fresno State College, Fresno San Fernando Valley State College, Northridge University of California, Davis University of California, Los Angeles
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	George Washington University, Washington
ILLINOIS	Illinois Teachers College Chicago-North Northwestern University, Evanston University of Chicago, Chicago University of Illinois, Urbana
INDIANA	Ball State University, Muncie
KANSAS	Wichita State University, Wichita
LOUISIANA	Southern University and A & M College, Baton Rouge
MARYLAND	University of Maryland, College Park
MASSACHUSETTS	Boston University, Boston
MINNESOTA	University of Minnesota, Minneapolis
NEVADA	University of Nevada, Reno
NEW YORK	City University of New York, Hunter College State University of New York at Stony Brook
OREGON	Marylhurst College, Marylhurst
TENNESSEE	George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville
TEXAS	Texas Southern University, Houston
WASHINGTON	Seattle University, Seattle
WISCONSIN	Marquette University, Milwaukee University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee

APPENDIX C

Questionnaire

EVALUATION OF EIMC MATERIALS 1966

Please check one:
____ Director
____ Staff
____ Participant

_____ Name and

_____ Location of Institute

_____

Please complete as many of the following questions as you feel qualified to answer.

1. How have EIMC materials been used in your Institute?
____ Demonstration
____ Lecture
____ Workshop
____ Reference
____ Other (Please explain.)

2. If they have not yet been used, how will they be used?
____ Demonstration
____ Lecture
____ Workshop
____ Reference
____ Other (Please explain.)

3. Please rate as excellent, adequate, or unsatisfactory the uses made of EIMC materials in your Institute:
____ Demonstration
____ Lecture
____ Workshop
____ Reference
____ Other

4. In what ways, if any, do you believe you will be able to apply in your own school system anything that you have learned from EIMC materials?

5. Please evaluate the units which you have received for this summer as excellent, good, fair, poor.

Unit	Value for Institute	Value for the elementary or secondary classroom

6. Which of the materials do you consider to be really promising innovations in the teaching of English?

7. Can you suggest ways to improve particular units for Institute use?

8. What kinds of materials or units are not now available in EIMC which should be there?

9. Would you order a selection of EIMC materials again next year? ____ Yes
____ No

Comment:

10. Which of the units ordered this year would you order again? Why?

11. Which of the units which you ordered this year would you omit? Why?

12. In general, do you find more useful generalized descriptions of curricula or units composed largely of specific lesson plans?

APPENDIX D

The Operation of an Institute Materials Center

This brief report on the operations of the 1966 EIMC may assist other disciplines which wish to plan the distribution of experimental curriculum materials to NDEA institutes in their fields.

The English Institute Materials Center reproduced and distributed selected experimental curriculum materials from the Curriculum Study Centers to NDEA Summer Institutes in English. The service, begun in 1965, was continued in 1966 by the Modern Language Association as licensee of the United States Office of Education which supported the institutes.

As a result of a meeting of the Directors of Study and Demonstration Centers in November 1965, twelve Centers agreed to contribute twenty-four units for distribution in 1966. The conference specified that no center contribute more than 300 pages of experimental materials and that no institute be allowed to order a greater total number of pages than 500 times the number of its participants and staff. The twelve Centers contributing units (see Appendix A) accepted the following calendar for EIMC operations:

10 December	Receipt at the Modern Language Association of materials for reproduction, and statements of items for which permissions must be cleared.
13 December - 15 January	Printing of 300 copies of all items.
20 January	Mailing of one set of materials to each director of an institute in English, reading, and disadvantaged youth with order form.
1 March	Deadline for receipt of orders from directors of institutes.
8 March	Final print order.
15 March	Final budget.
20 March	Purchase orders written for printing.
March & April	Receipt of materials from printer, preparation of invoices.
May	Shipping.
June	Mailing of invoices and correcting mistakes made in shipment.

The Centers met their deadlines admirably.

A brief report on the progress and goals of each Center, incorporated into an article, "New Materials for the Teaching of English: The English Program of the USOE" (see Appendix A), was automatically distributed to all participants and staff members in NDEA institutes using EIMC, as was a special issue of the "Indiana University Curriculum Study Center Newsletter." Because the quality of the individual reports was uneven and because institutes found the article useful, directors of Centers should be encouraged to give more attention to the preparation of their reports in 1967.

Although each of the Centers submitting materials to EIMC should be responsible for securing initial permissions, EIMC can be responsible for extending the permissions already granted to the individual Center. The matter of permissions caused unnecessary confusion in 1966.

EIMC can save both money and time if the materials have been carefully typed and proofread before they are submitted. In 1966 it was necessary to have Kent Associates, 12 East 12th Street, New York City, re-type more than 200 of the 3,774 pages of material contributed by the Centers.

PROCESSING OF COPY

All copy from individual Centers had to be proofed. Each unit was separately coded, paginated, checked to see if each page could be photographed, and re-typed if necessary. An initial memo to the printer was made for each unit, indicating specific pages which needed re-typing. EIMC checked each unit again after re-typing before having plates made. ENCO plates were used in 1966 and should be made again in 1967; up to 8,000 copies of a page can be made from each plate.

The printer at this stage made estimates of costs for preparing copy, the making of plates, and printing of 300 sets of materials to be sent in January to directors of Curriculum Study Centers, directors of Summer Institutes, the Office of Education, the Modern Language Association, and the National Council of Teachers of English.

PRELIMINARY MAILING

In 1966 EIMC sent complete sets of materials to all institute directors, eliminating the necessity of making out a detailed catalogue and allowing the director to study each unit before ordering. Early in January, each director received a letter from EIMC saying that a complete set of materials would reach him within two weeks, and listing the sources of the materials:

> These materials will come to you in five packages from the following sources:
>
> 1. Modern Language Association, New York, New York. (Units from the Centers at Columbia Teachers College, Gallaudet College, University of Georgia, University of Minnesota, University of Nebraska, Northwestern University, University of Oregon, Purdue University).

2. Badger Press, Jefferson, Wisc. (Units from the Center at the University of Wisconsin.)
3. United Business Service Co., Pittsburgh, Pa. (Units from the Center at Carnegie Institute of Technology.)
4. Indiana University Curriculum Study Center, Bloomington, Indiana. (Units from the Center at University of Indiana.)
5. National Council of Teachers of English, Champaign, Ill. (Units from the Centers at the University of Indiana and ISCPET.)

The MLA package will include an introductory statement about EIMC, order forms, and detailed instructions for ordering EIMC materials.

In most cases the materials are being sent by Special Fourth Rate -- Books, Special Handling, insured with return receipt requested. Where necessary, packages will be sent Air Parcel Post insured. If you have not received your complete shipment by February 15, please call the EIMC staff at (212) 777-7100.

You are not obliged to participate in EIMC. However, we urge your careful examination of the materials which you will shortly receive.

If you choose to participate, the cost of materials will be added to your institute contract through a special licensing agreement with the USOE. If you decide to participate, you must place your order before 1 March. This deadline is absolutely essential. Even if you decide not to participate, please notify us before 1 March.

All materials printed by EIMC were shipped from Kent. Boxes were ordered in advance, labels prepared, insurance manifest book and insurance numbers obtained from the post office. The initial mailing was simple because each package was identical in size and weight -- each package (other than those going to Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and Alaska) was sent SPECIAL FOURTH RATE--BOOKS--SPECIAL HANDLING--INSURED--RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED. All 254 packages were sent out in two days time -- registered, stapled securely, and closed with asphalt tape. Kent furnished the postage and was subsequently reimbursed. Flying Mail Man delivered packages to the post office and was adequate for this initial operation.

Because the bindery used by Kent was not able to deliver all materials at once, many books had to be handled twice. In 1967 EIMC should wait until all units are delivered and set up in an assembly-line fashion, for which Kent has facilities. Four to five persons are needed for this initial packing and mailing.

Packages mailed from other sources arrived later than those which came directly from Kent. Greater control is possible if the initial mailing comes from fewer sources -- preferably one source. Although such an arrangement might be difficult, having all materials sent from EIMC in 1967 will decrease the number of queries about lost packages and reduce the amount of time necessary for incidental correspondence.

The EIMC instruction sheet and order form was included in the initial mailing and should be kept as simple as possible. A more complete description of the contents

of each unit and of the work of each Center would, again, have saved institute directors from writing for additional explanations. (For instance, the description of the materials prepared at the Carnegie Institute of Technology should have described separately the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grade units and given some overview of the curriculum developed there.) The instruction sheet seems to have been clear and satisfactory.

Unlike 1966, the order form should be printed and each director asked to fill out two copies. It was necessary to Xerox each order in 1966. The order blank for each unit should also show the total number of pages ordered (Example: Carnegie -- 1A 10 [copies] (308) [pages per unit] 3080 pages [total number of pages ordered]) so that figures can be double checked easily, eliminating a major problem when working out a page price later. The shipping address was often different from the director's address, but in most cases this was not known until university purchase orders arrived later. University purchase orders are often delayed because schools cannot send them until the final cost of the materials is known. The order form should include the director's telephone area code and number, as well as his zip code, as it did not in 1966.

Although the final deadline for ordering had been stressed, many directors had not responded by 1 March. A telegram to directors of English institutes who had not ordered by the deadline brought in additional orders. Telegrams were not sent to Reading institute directors or Disadvantaged Youth institute directors, but they might well be in 1967.

PROCESSING OF ORDERS

Each order was numbered on arrival and this number used as a shipping number and even for final invoice number. A card was made for each of the twenty-four units to record the number of copies ordered. As a double check, each order was summarized on a sheet giving the order number, director's name and school, and showing the units ordered. The figures on any given unit column had to agree with the unit card. This simple system worked well.

After all orders were received, purchase orders were made out to Badger Press, United Business Service, the National Council of Teachers of English, and Indiana. Thirty-five extra copies of all units were ordered for EIMC office use. Kent Associates based its estimate on orders actually received, but included a cushion for possible late orders. These extra units produced by Kent and other suppliers enabled EIMC to fill several late orders.

BUDGET PREPARATION

The EIMC licensing agreement with the Office of Education allows EIMC to charge each institute an established page price multiplied by the total number of pages ordered for institute use. One of the key factors of the budget is, therefore, the page price. To determine it, one must know the print order (total number of pages) and the budget (total cost including printing, mailing, salaries, etc.). It is necessary to know the total pages ordered by institutes (NOT including the sample January mailing) and at the same time the final print order (including extra sets) and the estimates for the total cost of producing materials before

the page price can be calculated. Only then can the cost of every order be computed.

One must know exactly the print order and the cost of the initial mailing to make the final budget. Kent Associates' costs included negatives and plate, cost of re-typing pages, paper, presswork, bindery, etc. Other suppliers included Badger Press (Wisconsin), United Business Service (Carnegie), etc. The cost of materials from the outside suppliers and the cost of printing at Kent Associates made up the total printing costs.

The accounting department of the Modern Language Association helped prepare salary schedules. The cost of supplies, mailing, telephone and telegraph, permissions, etc. was based on actual expenditures in 1965. A unit cost per page of $0.023010 was reached. After the Office of Education was notified of the page price and total charge to each institute, and had approved the figures, each director was notified of the cost of the EIMC materials for his institute.

PERMISSIONS

The permissions procedure was not entirely satisfactory. The system in 1966 was simpler than that of 1965 because fewer initial permissions had to be obtained. The principal responsibility for obtaining permissions must, by the nature of the problem, rest with the individual Center.

SHIPMENT OF EIMC MATERIALS

EIMC used the facilities of Kent Associates to fill and ship materials printed by them. This system worked well. Labels and shipping lists were sent to the other suppliers so that they could ship orders directly and correctly. When some institutes did not receive materials, orders had to be filled from EIMC headquarters.

Shipments sent from New York and most other suppliers arrived promptly and with very few errors. Most errors were corrected easily and amounted to supplying only a few lost copies. Separate shipments of an Indiana "Newsletter" and of the article on the work of the English Program of the Office of Education reached the institutes without mishap.

Fewer problems seemed to occur in shipping in 1966 because of the experience of 1965. Streamlining procedures for ordering and the physical set-up at Kent made an assembly line system possible. The same two sizes of boxes were used for mailing throughout, but boxes were cut down to fit orders instead of being stuffed with filler material. Boxes were stapled and asphalt taped rather than tied. The same shipping methods were used as in the initial mailing and should be again in 1967.

PERSONNEL NEEDED

- One full-time assistant to handle the daily flow of orders and letters and to supervise mailings.
- Six persons at shipping time.
- One person responsible for permissions.